DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 072 342 AC 014 183

AUTHOR	Williams, Anne S.; And Others
TITLE	Leader Attitudinal Orientations in a Multi-County Area.
INSTITUTION	Montana State Univ., Bozeman. Dept. of Sociology.
SPONS AGENCY	Montana State Univ., Bozeman. Montana Agricultural Experiment Station.
PUB DATE	Aug 72
NOTE	28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the Rural Sociological Society, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, August 25-27, 1972
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Attitude Tests; Community Development; *Community Leaders; County Programs; Grouping Procedures; Interviews; *Leadership; Questionnaires; *Rural Development; *Surveys; Tables (Data); Technical Reports

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to examine the structure of leadership and the specific types of leaders as identified by attitudinal characteristics of individuals or groups of leaders. A 7-county development Federation in South-central Montana was studied. A pre-structured interview schedule containing 93 questions was administered to 102 leaders. Individuals most active in the Federation were later interviewed more intensively. Hypotheses of leader influence are discussed. Attitudinal variables were recoded and combined until three response sets were identified, forming the leader sub-groups: (1) the satisfied traditional, (2) the anti-government pessimist, and (3) the development-oriented activist. Leaders typically exhibited characteristics of one or more types. Twenty-nine percent were combinations of the satisfied traditional and the development activist. Twenty percent were "pure" satisfied traditionals. Fifteen percent were "pure" development activists. Power scores were computed for degree and type of influence exerted; higher power scores were held by satisfied traditionals and development activists. It was concluded that: (1) a pluralistic leadership structure with a variety of attitudes prevailed; (2) leadership structure was dominated by satisfied traditional tendencies, which will have to be modified for development to take place: and (3) no evidence was found that the federative arrangement was functioning effectively. A bibliography is provided. (KM)

ED 072342

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

LEADER ATTITUDINAL ORIENTATIONS IN A MULTI-COUNTY AREA

by

Anne S. Williams
C. Jack Gilchrist
William R. Lassey

Prepared for presentation to the Annual Meetings of the Rural Sociological Society, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, August 25-27, 1972.

Anne S. Williams is Coordinator of Social Science Research in the Center for Interdisciplinary Studies and Assistant Professor of Sociology, Montana State University, Bozeman, Montana. C. Jack Gilchrist is Assistant Professor of Sociology and William R. Lassey is Associate Professor of Sociology and Research Associate in the Center for Interdisciplinary Studies.

A001183

INTRODUCTION*

During the 1960's there was a notable increase in regional and area development efforts throughout the United States. Federal programs under the jurisdiction of the U. S. Departments of Housing and Urban Development, Commerce, and Agriculture each promoted area development schemes through special funding programs. Likewise, many states have been divided into multi-county areas or regions for administrative, planning and developmental purposes.[1] In a relatively few instances groups of counties have organized for collaborative purposes on their own initiative.

The role and perspective of local leadership in the implementation of multi-county organizational schemes has been much discussed but little examined. Leadership research has tended to emphasize leader behavior in complex organizations or single communities. We know little about leadership behavior, leadership structure or organizational mechanisms that have been effective for area or regional development programs. Yet it seems quite clear that new multi-county units must devise strategies for tapping area-wide leadership potential and must learn to develop regional linkages among area leaders if they are to

---

*The research reported here was part of a ten state regional project on "Criteria for Defining Rural Development Areas." Financial and administrative support from the Agricultural Experiment Station at Montana State University is gratefully acknowledged, as is the considerable assistance provided by staff members of the Cooperative Extension Service, officials of the South Central Montana Development Federation, and our colleagues on the Regional Technical Committee which organized and supported the project.

[1]For a further description and analysis of the various approaches used, see Davis McEntire, Gregory Eckman and William R. Lassey, Multi-County Organizations in Rural Development A Preliminary Report, Berkeley, California Gianini Foundation, (in press).

function effectively.

For our purposes, a "leader" is any individual who has exercised noticeable influence on events in a county or community as judged by peer leaders.[2] similarly "leadership" is defined as interpersonal influence or power exercised by a specific individual or group of individuals in an organization, community, county, or multi-county setting. The research objectives were designed to examine the structure of leadership and the specific types of leaders as identified by attitudinal characteristics of individuals or groups of leaders. We were interested in how the attitudes of identified sub-groups or types of local leaders influenced action decisions about local or area development. We had hypothesized that the relative success or failure of multi-county development programs could be explained in large part by examining the attitudinal orientations of local area leaders. We anticipated that leaders could be categorized or "typed" by their attitudinal predispositions. By correlating leader influence with attitudinal predisposition as the independent variables, we believed we could explain the differential success of the study counties in moving toward their multi-county development goals.

The Research Setting

A seven county development Federation in south-central Montana was selected for detailed study, in part because much of the initiative in the formation of this multi-county unit came from local citizen leaders. After extensive informal meetings and discussions beginning

---

[2] Methodology for leader identification is described on page 4.

in 1965 the Federation was formally constituted in 1969. The purpose of the organization was "to promote the general welfare of the member counties"; initiators of the Federation believed that by increasing the economic and social development of any one of the small communities, the stability of the entire area would be enhanced.[3]

The organizational structure of the Federation was designed to be flexible and minimally binding on member counties. Although the Federation was informally endorsed by county officials, no official commitments of financial support were made by county governments or other official units. The Federation charter was signed by representatives of volunteer development organizations in five of the counties, and by interested individuals from the two counties which had not initiated formal supporting organizations. Each county had one voting representative and an alternate who could vote when the official representative was not present. Representatives from agencies of the Department of Agriculture, staff from the Cooperative Extension Service, and County Commissioners were not directly involved in Federation actions but were consulted and kept informed of activities undertaken.

Representatives to the Federation were in every instance rural residents, from agriculture or smaller towns. Although the intent

---

[3]For more detail on goals and history of the Federation, see Sharon Hanton, William R. Lassey and Anne S. Williams, Area Development in Montana: A Case Study, Research Report No. XX, Agricultural Experiment Station, Montana State University, Bozeman, Montana, 1972, and William R. Lassey, Anne S. Williams, and Howard L. Huffman, Multi-County Areas as a Tool for Development in Montana, Department of Sociology, Center for Planning and Development, Agricultural Experiment Station Research Report No. 2, Montana State University, 1970, p. 29.

and objectives of the organization did not exclude attention to urban problems, primary concern was focused on implementation of projects which could assist small towns and rural areas. There was no major effort to involve leaders from the only major urban center within the seven counties, although at the time of the study it contained roughly 70% of the area population and was clearly the focal point for marketing and purchasing as well as many cultural and social activities for the seven county area.

Procedures

Local leaders were identified by the following criteria: (1) key informants or knowledgeables were asked to name, and rank by degree and type of influence, those individuals whom they felt had the most impact on events in the area; (2) the top leaders thus identified were asked to nominate additional leaders in the same manner, (3) county-wide issues which had been resolved or were in the process of resolution, were identified and individuals having major impact on issue resolution were nominated, (4) significant elective or appointive office holders were added to the list. Individuals having the most influence, as indicated by these criteria, were selected to form the leadership sample. A pre-structured interview schedule containing 93 questions was administered to 102 leaders in seven counties.[4]

The urban trade center was deliberately under-sampled; only about one-third of the selected leaders were from the urban metropolitan area, even though it contained more than two-thirds of the

[4] An eighth county joined the Federation in 1970 shortly after data were collected for this study. Two additional counties have since joined.

population.[5] Table I shows the total population and leader distribution for the seven counties.[6]

Individuals who had been most active in the Federation were later interviewed more intensively using an open-ended interview schedule. These less structured interviews provided greater depth of information and insight into the character of organizational and leadership patterns.

HYPOTHESES OF LEADER INFLUENCE

Leadership as a Function of Power or Influence[7]

Previous research has supported two distinct viewpoints regarding the manner in which community power and influence are distributed. The "elitist" viewpoint suggests that power and influence exist in a pyramidal fashion, characterized by a single, cohesive leadership configuration; this concept was first systematically investigated and developed by Hunter.[8] Another viewpoint is supported in studies under-

---

[5]The deliberate under-sampling was justified, we felt, if we were to secure an adequate population of top leaders from each of the seven counties, and still maintain a total sample size of approximately 100, which was the limit established by available research funds. We have not weighted the urban sample, but rather, have assumed these leaders adequately represented a portion of the leadership pool even though they also represent a larger population.

[6]Tables are in Appendix A at end of the paper.

[7]For purposes of this paper "power" represents a potential for influence which may or may not be exercised. Attempted leadership may fail because power and influence do not exist. Successful leadership without exception involves effective exercise of power and influence, even though defined goals are not reached. Effective leadership implies that group or organizational goals are accomplished as a result of the effective use of leader influence. See Bernard M. Bass, Leadership, Psychology and Organizational Behavior. Harper and Row, 1960, Chapter Six.

[8]Hunter, Floyd, Community Power Structure A Study of Decision-Makers, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1953.

taken by Dahl, Polsby and others suggesting a "pluralistic" view of leadership in which power and influence are widely distributed throughout the community.[9,10]

In an effort to clarify previously disparate findings Walton reanlyzed and elaborated existing research data, and identified four types or degrees of power and influence distribution: (1) pyramidal - characterized by a monolithic, monopolistic or a single cohesive leadership configuration, (2) factional - in which at least two durable leadership factions compete for advantage, (3) coalitional - in which the leadership varies with the issue, being made up of fluid coalitions, and (4) amorphous - in which there is no persistent pattern of leadership influence or power.[11] Walton further suggested that the most accurate description of community power and influence involves a framework in which the leadership structure is composed of diverse and competing sub-groups, each holding varying degrees of influence and power.[12]

---

[9]Dahl, Robert A., Who Governs? New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1961, and Nelson W. Polsby, Community Power and Political Theory, Yale University Press: New Haven, 1963.

[10]Adherents of the "elitist" interpretation have criticized the "pluralist" camp for failing to understand the community as an organized and structured system. "Elitist" supporters have, in turn, been accused of allowing methodological biases to affect their findings; a specific criticism is that the reputational method of identifying leaders supports the "elitist" viewpoint, since community elites are most often named by respondents.

[11]Walton, John, "A Systematic Survey of Community Power Research," in Michael Aiken and Paul E. Mott (eds.), The Structure of Community Power, New York: Random House, 1970, p. 489.

[12]Ibid, p. 516.

Alternative Conceptual Hypotheses

We would suggest an alternative conceptualization of how leadership affects community and particularly multi-community, decision-making. We did not believe that the independent variable, leadership influence, adequately explained the differential success experienced by communities involved in area development programs. Our hypothesis was that the attitudinal orientations of the total area-wide leadership pool were also significant independent variables. We hypothesized that the leader population would consist of a variety of sub-groups and each sub-group would be identifiable by the similarity of leader attitudinal orientations. Classification of leaders by sub-groups does not imply that these leaders are personally acquainted, but rather the sub-group classifications represent a particular type of attitudinal inclination. Identification of sub-group attitudinal predispositions, and the relative power of these leader sub-groups would allow us to predict or explain differential county success in attaining area-wide development goals.

We believed that the power and influence of any sub-group with respect to specific decisions would vary depending on two major variables: (1) size of the sub-group as a proportion of the total leadership population and (2) the number and size of competing sub-groups within the leadership population. We also hypothesized that exertion of leadership would vary on a continuum from (1) "development-activist" or change oriented efforts to achieve new goals, solve problems or realize potential opportunities to (2) "satisfied traditional" or status quo efforts directed toward stopping changes from occuring or attempting to block achievement of goals defined by other sub-groups. If the total leader-

ship pool contained a high proportion of "traditional" or "status quo" oriented sub-groups, their efforts would tend to be effective in blocking change; under these circumstances change oriented efforts would be effective only if great skill, energy, and commitment were sufficient to raise the influence level of the change oriented leaders.

Further, we predicted that degree of commitment to support for multi-county organization and participation in local or area activities supporting planning and development goals would be directly and positively related to a "development activist" attitudinal orientation. Further, those counties in which "development activist" leadership attitudes predominated in the leadership pool would tend to be most supportive of multi-county activity, while those counties in which "satisfied traditional" attitudes predominated would tend to be least active.

The leadership analysis approach described here is not intended to be static; this is, the size, number and orientation of sub-groups can vary over time as the population increases or population shifts occur and as new information enters the system with subsequent effects on attitudes and behavioral orientations. New leadership sub-groups may emergy and develop influence which will alter the leadership structure within the total system; achievement of new goals may then become more probable.

The inter-relationships between (1) sub-groups of leaders with specific attitudinal orientations, (2) community and area organizational structure and (3) decision outcomes are particularly relevant to an analysis of regional leadership structure. The weakening of "horizontal patterns" and loss of "community autonomy," as described by Warren, may

be factors which contribute to an area organizational structure characterized by a number of sub-systems or sub-groups largely independent of each other.[13] Previous research would support the notion that the extent to which specific sub-groups dominate decisions and the area organizational structure is an index of the influence and power distribution among the total leadership pool. The size of the community or area is also likely to be a gross indicator of the number of sub-groups.[14] To be successful, organizational theory would suggest that the leadership of a multi-county Federation would have to define broad goals and initiate projects of benefit to all area residents without, at the same time, jeopardizing the goals of existing special interest groups, or threatening existing centers of power. In Walton's terminology, the existing "factional" or "coalitional" distribution of area influence would have to be replaced by what we have called a "federative" arrangement, in which the leadership factions would be willing to sacrifice special interest goals when they conflicted or competed with objectives selected for area-wide implementation.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

The leaders appearing in the sample were generally of long tenure in the area and were largely beyond middle age; 69% of the 102 leaders interviewed had lived in their home area for 20 years or more, while 64% were 45 years or older. Only 7% were under 35 years of age and only 14% had lived in the area for less than 10 years. It is noteworthy

---

[13] Warren, Roland L., The Community in America, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964.

[14] Aiken, Michael, "The Distribution of Community Power: Structural Bases and Social Consequences," in The Structure of Community Power, p. 516.

that those counties which had been most active in the multi-county federation contained a greater proportion of younger leaders, and likewise the principal leaders of the Federation were somewhat younger than the county average.

The low proportion of younger leaders in the total sample is not surprising, since these rural counties have each experienced heavy out-migration of young people--particularly those with more advanced education who might presumably be the likeliest candidates for influential leadership roles. The heavy out-migration is obviously related to the shortage of jobs for educated younger people. Although we know of no studies which have reported attitudinal inclinations of out-migrants, we believe out-migrants would tend to be among the most progressive or development oriented of the younger population.

Analytic Techniques

The leader types or sub-groups were identified through an analytical procedure developed by one of the co-authors.[15] We recoded six attitudinal variables at a time according to hypothetical definitions of what we considered "consistent" response sets. We then attempted several hypothetically meaningful combinations of the sets of six attitudinal variables, until we identified those combinations of six variables (response sets) with the highest total frequencies. Three response sets were identified which then formed the basis for definition of the attitudinal predispositions of leader sub-groups.

---

[15] See C. Jack Gilchrist, "A Multi-Dimensional Response Set Identifier" (tentative title), in preparation, to be published as an Experiment Station Bulletin.

Each leader was assigned a score based on the degree to which he conformed to the three combinations (matrices) of six attitudinal variables. For each of the six variables, if a respondent conformed to our hypothetical definition of "consistent," he scored two points, if not, he scored one point. For the total response set one could score a maximum of twelve points, or a minimum of six points. We then subtracted "five" from each respondent score thereby converting our maximum and minimum scores to "seven" and "one" respectively. Only respondents scoring "five" or more were defined as conforming to the attitudinal response sets. In other words, respondents had to exhibit at least four of the six attitudinal characteristics to be identified by that particular attitudinal predisposition.

Leadership Types

Three major classifications of leaders were evident, as well as several variations from the major types. The major categories and approximate proportions of each are shown in Table II.

Most leaders tended to fall at a distinct point in the classification but did not necessarily exhibit all characteristics of that category. The attitudinal predispositions shown in Table II range from (1) the "satisfied traditional" with a relatively high level of optimism and satisfaction with local community improvement efforts, to (2) the "anti-government pessimist" with a relatively negative view of his county's future and a critical attitude toward existing government sponsored development possibilities, to (3) the "development oriented activist" with a broad conception of area-wide needs and opportunities and a willingness to work on multi-county development projects.

The "Satisfied Traditional" reflected the most conservative attitudinal predisposition and the highest level of satisfaction with local community progress among all area leaders. This leader sub-group indicated a very high level of satisfaction and confidence in the existing area leadership. Satisfied traditionals felt that area leaders were forward looking, came to agreement quickly, and were willing to face critical issues in creative and innovative ways. This strong confidence in the capability of area leadership was also reflected in the "satisfied traditionals'" insistance that local communities did not need to employ the expertise of community development professionals. "Satisfied traditionals'" confidence in grass roots community development was also reflected in their belief that local groups could work together to accomplish significant community progress. Forty percent of the leaders of the multi-county area were characterized as "satisfied traditionals." (See Table III for a listing of the items used to define this attitudinal orientation.)

The "Anti-government Pessimist" attitudinal predisposition, on the other hand, reflected considerable dissatisfaction with existing government development programs as well as the ability of local people to respond to community needs. Anti-government pessimists believed that federal agencies dominated local development programs and that federal agencies were ineffective in trying to solve local community problems. These very negative anti-government attitudes were also directed toward state agencies, whom the "anti-government pessimist" believed were ineffective, and toward local government whom the "anti-government pessimist" accused of not meeting local community needs.

It was also characteristic of "anti-government pessimists" to believe that local communities were not well organized for community development and that local people did not respond to critical community problems and needs (See Table III). Twenty-four percent of the leadership sample was characterized by this attitudinal orientation.

The "Development Activist" reflected an attitudinal optimism about the ability of local leaders to effect significant and positive community change. The "development activist"was so named because of his considerable attendance at local community meetings and his great involvement in local community development organizations as well as the multi-county Federation. The "development activist" was most characterized by his strong attitudinal and behavioral support for the multi-county Federation. "Development activists" believed that community development programs affect everyone in the community, and therefore, supporting developments in neighboring communities and counties is advantageous to the entire multi-county area. The "development activist" felt strongly that intercounty cooperation helped everyone because one county learned from others and progress in one county positively affected all the counties (See Table III). Thirty-two percent of area leaders were identified as "development activists."

It is important to note that leaders did not always "fit" exactly into one of the three types described above, but rather, leaders typically exhibited characteristics of one or more types (See Table IV). The most common combination was the "satisfied traditional" and the "development activist." Twenty-nine percent of the sample exhibited these attitudinal characteristics. Although apparently contradictory attitudinal predis-

positions, data from the in-depth interviews supported the theory that this sub-group of leaders was basically status quo oriented but also had a desire to take advantage of "progressive" developments being initiated by their "pure" development activist counterparts. Leaders who exhibited characteristics of the "satisfied traditional" and the "development activist" appeared to be substantially more conservative than their "pure" development activist counterparts, but nevertheless were still willing to entertain the concept of multi-county development and were also willing to participate in the multi-county Federation. However, it is important to emphasize that this attitudinal predisposition was strongly influenced by a status quo-satisfied traditional orientation.

The multi-county area was apparently influenced strongly by leaders with satisfied traditional orientations. Twenty percent of the sample were classified as "pure" satisfied traditionals. In comparison, the next most frequent attitudinal classification was the "pure" development activist which comprised 15% of the leader sample (See Table IV).

Leader Influence

"Power scores" for each leader were computed using data generated from the questionnaire. We asked all respondents to name those individuals whom they felt had the greatest influence on issues of area-wide importance. We then asked respondents (1) to indicate the type of influence these leaders exerted - whether they influenced a broad range of issues or selected, special issues, and (2) to indicate the degree of influence exerted by the identified leaders - whether they were among

the most influential, among the moderately influential or the least influential. "Type of influence" scores were formed by assigning two points for broad issue influence and one point for influence on single issues, summing the points, and dividing by the number of respondent nominations. The "degree of influence" score was computed by assigning three points for each nomination of "most influential," two points for nominations of "moderately influential," and one point for "least influential" nominations. The total points were then summed and divided by the number of leader nominations.[16] After forming the "degree" and "type" scores, we computed the total "power" score for each leader by multiplying the two scores. Leader power scores so derived ranged from a minimum of "zero" to a maximum of "six." Table V shows the range and frequency of leader power scores by attitudinal predisposition. It is important to remember that not every area-wide influential was interviewed, and therefore the data will show more leaders with power scores than are reflected in the attitudinal sub-type data.

It is apparent that for the multi-county study area, the "satisfied traditional" and the "development activist" attitudinal predispositions were held by more leaders having higher power scores than the "anti-government pessimist" attitudinal orientation (See Table V). Although the mean "power" scores for each of the attitudinal orientations are

---

[16] Although "number of nominations" is an important variable, we concluded that it was a less reliable indicator of leader influence for this study since for the seven study counties our respondent N varied from eight to thirty-nine (See Table I), and therefore, the probablity of being nominated also varied with the county sample size.

strikingly similar, the fact that there were significantly more "satisfied traditionals" and "development activists" than "anti-government pessimists" supports the theory that the latter sub-group would have much less influence on area-wide decision-making.

Table VI reflects the leader scores of the most influential leaders in each of the counties and their attitudinal predispositions. One can easily see that counties four and six had a relatively greater number of high influence leaders of the "development activist" predisposition. These attitudinal orientations and influence scores were readily reflected by the very active representation and involvement in Federation activities of county four and county six leaders. In fact leaders from these two counties were among the most active among Federation leaders and appeared to be among the key decision-makers in the Federation.

On the other hand, the leadership structure of county seven seemed to be heavily dominated by leaders of the "satisfied traditional" predisposition. County seven was the one county which failed to become actively involved in the Federation, although a small minority of leaders attempted to encourage county involvement.

Counties one, two, and three did become involved in the Federation, and at least one individual from each of these counties was actively involved in key decision-making regarding Federation activities. One individual from county three provided by far the largest amount of leadership and direction for the Federation. It did appear, however, that there was no identifiable leadership group with significant power in counties one, two or three.

County five appeared to vacillate in its commitment to Federation

activities. At times this county was heavily involved in Federation activities while at other times county representatives seemed to withdraw from making decisions regarding Federation issues. This vacillation is readily reflected in Table V which shows approximately half of the most influential county leaders were "satisfied traditionals" while the remaining half were "development activists."

Federation Representatives

Key influentials in the multi-county Federation can all be classified as "development activists"; this group of leaders seemed to provide continuing leadership for the Federation at the time of the study. The representatives from counties one, two, three and seven, however, were among the less influential of county and area-wide leaders. Counties four, five and six seemed to be the most active and industrious in their efforts to facilitate Federation success, and were also represented by the most influential leaders within their counties.

Horizontal and Vertical Ties

The Federation was the first "grass roots" attempt to create horizontal ties across several counties. Until the advent of the Federation, cross-county ties had been very weak and informal. "Agri-business" concerns provided some examples of collaborative efforts on agricultural problems, but "main street" businessmen and industrial interests were not much involved in these activities. Horizontal ties within the individual rural counties were likewise rather weak, the two primary rural centers of activity ("main street" and "agri-business") seemed to communicate inadequately and in several counties, infrequently.

Geographic compatibility and presence of a major trade center with

surrounding hinterland were the main criteria for delineation of Federation boundaries. The major transportation and communication networks linked the surrounding small towns and counties to the urban center. However, there was essentially no organizational or governmental unit tying the area together; pre-existing structures to facilitate multi-county or area-wide collaboration simply did not exist prior to the Federation. Vertical ties between local officials and state and federal governments and to chain retail establishments controlled from outside the area may have tended to obstruct collaboration among leaders, thereby weakening the probability of viable horizontal ties across county lines.

Federation leaders were in the early stages of developing a network of interpersonal relationships among the various county leaders when this study was undertaken. No single individual was consistently nominated as a leader throughout the multi-county area, and only one individual was nominated as a leader by respondents residing outside his county. "Area leaders" probably did not in fact exercise influence throughout the multi-county area, but rather strongly influenced a few leaders in their own counties. The bulk of the leaders interviewed in this study were essentially "local" influentials. In this sense, a horizontal pattern of leadership had been established to only a very limited degree, and certainly not across the entire Federation area.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The evidence from this study suggests that a pluralistic leadership structure containing a variety of attitudinal sub-groups prevailed in the multi-county study area. Power to affect decisions of area-wide

significance did not seem to reside within any of the attitudinal subgroups, while the "development activist" and the "satisfied traditional" attitudinal orientations seemed often to oppose each other. The area leadership structure was clearly dominated by "satisfied traditional" tendencies, however. Although some "anti-government pessimists" appeared to have substantial power within their individual counties, the relatively small number of "anti-government pessimists" suggests they would not exert significant influence if opposed by leaders representing either of the other two attitudinal predispositions. However, if the "anti-government pessimists" and "satisfied traditionals" were to form a coalition in opposition to proposals forwarded by the "development activists," one could predict that such proposals would be defeated by the larger number and greater influence of the "pessimist-traditional" coalition.

Three of the counties lacked leaders having any degree of influence. Although representatives from each of these counties had been actively involved in the Federation, one might anticipate that these three counties would not be able to elicit any degree of formal governmental support for the Federation, simply because the county leadership structure seemed "amorphous," or lacking identifiable direction. Certainly at the time of the study, Federation representatives from these three counties did not have the power to marshal widespread county commitment to the Federation.

The fact that the urban trade center (County 7) was not actively involved in Federation activities is likely to seriously impede the success with which Federation principals will be able to effect area-

wide development programs. County 7 was also characterized by a relatively large number of "satisfied traditionals," and therefore one might predict future conflict between this leader sub-group and the "development activists."

There was no evidence from this study that the "federative" arrangement was functioning effectively in the area. Rural related centers of influence had been pursuing limited objectives associated with agricultural and small town development, rather than competing with or accomodating to small town businessmen or the urban trade center interests. The strongly held attitudinal predispositions of the major influentials in each of the counties seemed to provide the basis upon which the three main development philosophies could confront and compete with one another. The area leadership structure seemed to conform most closely to the "amorphous" structure in which the leader alignments varied with the issue, and no one leader sub-group or attitudinal predisposition dominated all the time.

There appeared to be a need for a broader and more representative organizational mechanism for the area, if all major leader sub-groups were to be involved and committed to the multi-county development objectives. The organizational structure should provide a neutral forum in which divergent viewpoints might be expressed on issues of area-wide relevance, and decisions achieved through democratic process. Such a forum must be perceived as a legitimate organizational setting for leaders to participate with minimum threat of domination by one or a few leadership sub-groups. In order to produce decisions with a clear mandate for implementation, top influentials representing

the three main attitudinal predispositions must be involved. Definition of clear goals with input from all leader sub-groups, and continuing good communication among area leaders are obvious key ingrediants as well.

However, it should be strongly emphasized that a more representative organizational structure will not in itself facilitate area development Modification of the "satisfied traditional" attitudinal predispositions of the more influential leaders will also have to occur so that "progressive" development schemes are more acceptable to them. Although an appropriate organizational structure is necessary to assure input and collaboration from all segments of the leader population, the commitment of all influential area leaders to the multi-county goals appear to us as the more critical variables in eventual success or failure of multi-county development plans. The identification of area leader attitudinal predispositions and their corresponding power or influence in area decision-making is therefore a necessary prerequisite to the planning of effective action programs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aiken, Michael, "The Distribution of Community Power: Structural Bases and Social Consequences," in The Structure of Community Power, New York: Random House, 1970.

Bass, Bernard M., Leadership, Psychology and Organizational Behavior, Harper and Row, 1960.

Dahl, Robert A., Who Governs? New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1961.

Hanton, Sharon, William R. Lassey and Anne S. Williams, Area Development in Montana: A Case Study, Research Report No. XX, Agricultural Experiment Station, Montana State University, Bozeman, Montana, 1972.

Hunter, Floyd, Community Power Structure: A Study of Decision-Makers, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1953.

Lassey, William R., Anne S. Williams, and Howard L. Huffman, Multi-County Areas as a Tool for Development in Montana, Department of Sociology, Center for Planning and Development, Agricultural Experiment Station, Research Report No. 2, Montana State University, 1970.

McEntire, Davis, Gregory Eckman and William R. Lassey, Multi-County Organizations in Rural Development. A Preliminary Report, Berkeley, California: Gianini Foundation, (in press).

Polsby, Nelson W., Community Power and Political Theory, Yale University Press: New Haven, 1963.

Walton, John, "A Systematic Survey of Community Power Research," in Michael Aiken and Paul E. Mott (eds.), The Structure of Community Power, New York: Random House, 1970.

Warren, Roland L., The Community in America, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964.

APPENDIX A

TABLE I

Population and Leader Sample Distribution by Counties, 1970[a]

	Multi-County Leaders		Population			
	In Sample	Not in Sample	Total	Rural[b]	Town[c]	Urban[d]
Seven County Area	102	18	109,253	25,502	8,100	75,651
County 1	12	3	7,080	5,236	1,844	--
County 2	8	1	931	931	--	--
County 3	11	2	3,734	1,618	2,116	--
County 4	12	2	4,632	3,459	1,173	--
County 5	11	4	2,980	1,388	1,592	--
County 6	9	3	2,529	1,154	1,375	--
County 7	39	3	87,367	11,716	--	75,651
Percent	85%	15%	100%	23%	8%	69%

[a]1970 U. S. Census of Population, First County Summary Tape.

[b]Includes all towns under 1000 population, as well as non-town rural population.

[c]Includes only towns of 1000 to 2500.

[d]Includes towns of 2500 or more, as well as urbanized areas outside of trade center city limits.

TABLE II

Sub-Types of Leader Attitudinal Predispositions*

1.	Satisfied Traditional	40%
2.	Anti-Government Pessimist	24%
3.	Development Activist	32%
4.	No distinct predisposition	13%

*Will total more than 100% because some leaders exhibited characteristics of more than one attitudinal type.

TABLE III

Attitudinal Items Used to Define Leader Predispositions

Matrix I - Satisfied Traditional

Leaders are forward looking
Leadership does not withdraw
Leaders do not emphasize tradition
Leaders come to agreement quickly
Local groups work together
No need for a community development professional

Matrix II - Anti-Government Pessimist

Federal agencies are ineffective
Federal agencies dominate
State agencies are ineffective
Local government does not meet community needs
People do not respond to local problems
Community not well organized for community development

Matrix III - Development Activist

Advantages in supporting development in neighboring counties
One county learns from others
Need for multi-county federation
Attends many community development meetings
Active in county development programs
Many are affected by community development programs

TABLE IV

Leader Attitudinal Predispositions by County

	Satisfied Traditional	Anti-Government Pessimist	Development Activist	Satisfied Traditional + Development Activist	Satisfied Traditional + Anti-Government Pessimist	Anti-Government Pessimist + Development Activist	Satisfied Traditional, Anti-Gov't Pessimist, Development Activist	None	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
County 1	2	1	6	--	--	--	--	3	12
County 2	3	1	1	1	--	--	--	2	8
County 3	1	--	--	4	1	1	4	--	11
County 4	--	1	3	2	--	3	1	2	12
County 5	3	--	--	4	--	--	--	4	11
County 6	2	--	1	5	--	1	--	--	9
County 7	9	3	4	13	3	4	1	2	39
Total	20	6	15	29	4	9	6	13	102*

*Does not total 100% due to rounding.

TABLE V

Leader Power Scores and Attitudinal Predispositions

	Power Score								
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	Mean Power Score
Satisfied Traditional	11	1	7	10	12	8	10	59	3.27
Anti-Gov't Pessimist	6	1	2	3	3	2	8	25	3.36
Development Activist	15	1	8	7	9	7	12	59	3.06
None	4	--	1	3	2	2	1	13	3.30
Leaders Not in Sample	--	--	2	6	3	4	3	18	4.00
TOTAL	36	3	20	29	29	23	34		3.25

TABLE VI

Leader Scores of "Five" or More And Attitudinal Predispositions By County

	Satisfied Traditional	Anti-Government Pessimist	Development Activist	None	Not in Sample
County 1		1		2	1
County 2	1	1			1
County 3	1	1	2		1
County 4	1	3	5		
County 5	4		3	1	1
County 6	3	1	5		2
County 7	8	3	4		1
TOTAL	18	10	19	3	7

ERIC Clearinghouse
MAR 7 1973
on Adult Education